

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	iO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,112	10/689,112 10/20/2003		Mark T. Stewart	P-8417.15	4236
27581	7590	05/04/2005		EXAMINER	
	ONIC, IN		COHEN, LEE S		
710 MEDTRONIC PARKWAY NE MS-LC340				ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55432-5604				3739	
				DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		ϵ					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/689,112	STEWART ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Lee S. Cohen	3739					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Apr	<u>oril 2005</u> .	,					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This	action is non-final.						
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 66-86 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 66-86 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and all accomposed are all accomposed and accomposed are all accomposed are all accomposed and accomposed are all accomposed are a	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage					
Attachment(s)							
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/689,112

Art Unit: 3739

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 84 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Hall et al (6,652,517). Applicant's attention is directed to the Figure 1 embodiment..

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 66-73, 75-83, and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall et al (6,652,517) in view of Phan et al (6,529,756). The basic catheter assembly is disclosed by Figure 1 of Hall et al including temperature sensors proximal and distal of sections of the ablation section. The main feature the reference fails to disclose relates to the porous ablation section. Such a feature is disclosed by Phan et al which disclose a microporous polymer region having an ablation electrode within the ablation section. Conductive fluid is supplied to the microporous region to effect ablation. Given this teaching, it would have been obvious to the

Application/Control Number: 10/689,112

Art Unit: 3739

skilled artisan to employ such an ablation section in Hall et al to provide a more effective ablation lesion. The particular material and porosity of the polymer would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to select to optimize performance of the device.

Claim 74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall et al (6,652,517) in view of Phan et al (6,529,756) as applied to claim 71 above, and further in view of Jaraczewski et al (5,938,694). The Hall et al reference fails to disclose the use of sensing electrodes on the distal portion. Jaraczewski et al show the use of both mapping and ablation electrodes on a coil at varying locations (see column 5, lines 37-62). Given this teaching, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to employ mapping electrodes in the ablation section in Hall et al to provide a more accurately located ablation lesion.

Claim 85 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall et al in view of Jaraczewski et al (5,938,694). The Hall et al reference fails to disclose the use of sensing electrodes on the distal portion. Jaraczewski et al show the use of both mapping and ablation electrodes on a coil at varying locations (see column 5, lines 37-62). Given this teaching, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to employ mapping electrodes in the ablation section in Hall et al to provide a more accurately located ablation lesion.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed April 21, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The only argument presented is that the Hall et al reference fails to disclose a catheter having proximal, intermediate, and distal portions. As set forth at column 2, the catheter includes distal end portion 52. Inherently, the catheter has to include a proximal end portion at

Art Unit: 3739

the end opposite the distal end portion and an intermediate portion extending between the proximal and distal portions. Accordingly, the argument is without merit.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lee S. Cohen whose telephone number is 571-272-4763. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on 571-272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3739

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lee S. Cohen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3739

LSC April 29, 2005